

REMARKS

Claims 1 – 8, 10, 13 – 17, and 32 - 39 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claims 1 – 8, 10, 13 – 17, and 32 - 34 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

The Examiner alleges that the phrase, “each ridge including a plurality of discreet, spaced apart regions” is unclear. Claim 1, therefore, has been amended and rewritten. Claim 1 now calls for the ridges to formed of a plurality of discontinuous, discreet, and spaced apart regions. Such a configuration of the ridges is depicted, for example, in Figure 19. Applicants respectfully assert that claim 1 now particularly points out and distinctly claims the subject matter of the claimed invention. Accordingly, reconsideration and withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1, 10, 13 – 17, and 33 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croat (U.S. Pat. No. 4,851,058) cited by the Applicants in the IDS submitted August 31, 2001) in view of Toshio et al. (Toshio, Japanese Patent Document No. 09-271909). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

As stated above, claim 1 has been amended to call for ridges that include a plurality of discontinuous, discreet, and spaced apart regions. Neither Croat, Toshio, nor any combination thereof teaches such a cooling roll. More particularly, referring to Figures (a) and (c) of Toshio, a cooling roll is depicted wherein the ridges and grooves are provided in either a v-shape or a w-shape. As Toshio does not teach a plurality of ridges that include a plurality of discontinuous, discreet, and spaced apart regions, the alleged combination of Croat and Toshio does not yield the claimed method and, therefore, the claimed method is not obvious. Claim 1 and each corresponding dependent claim, therefore, are not obvious.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Croat in view of Toshio, and further in view of Fukuno (USPN 5,665,177). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 2, 3, and 5-8 are dependent on claim 1, addressed above. These claims are not obvious for at least the same reasons. That is, neither Croat, Toshio, nor Fukuno teach, suggest, or provide motivation to utilize a cooling roll with ridges that include a plurality of discontinuous, discreet, and spaced apart regions. As such, these claims should be in condition for allowance.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 35 - 39 are allowable. Applicants acknowledge, with thanks, the allowance of these claims. Further, the Examiner states that claims 4, 32, and 34 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejection(s) under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, set forth in this Office Action and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As stated above, Applicants have amended claim 1 to call for ridges including a plurality of

discontinuous, discreet, and spaced apart regions. None of the cited references teach, suggest, or provide motivation to utilize such a cooling roll. Claims 35 – 39, therefore, should now be in condition for allowance for at least the same reasons as their independent base claim.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action, and as such, the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated:

Jan 12, 2004

By:

G. Gregory Schivley
G. Gregory Schivley/Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade/Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

GGS/BEW/JAH

BEST AVAILABLE COPY